

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ALEX JONES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ST. PAUL FIRE & MARINE  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C15-531 MJP

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. No. 38.) Having considered the Parties' briefing and the related record, the Court GRANTS the motion.

The Court has now twice considered the question of whether or not attorney Douglas Anderson was an appointed official of Grant County under the insurance contract issued by Defendant St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company. (Dkt. Nos. 27 at 3-5, 42 at 2-3.) Each time, the Court found that Mr. Anderson was an independent contractor and was not an appointed official, and concluded that Mr. Anderson was not covered under the insurance policy

1 at issue in this case. (Id.) In the interest of judicial economy, the Court incorporates those  
2 discussions here.

3 Defendant now moves for summary judgment on all of Plaintiffs' claims, arguing that  
4 because Mr. Anderson was not an insured under the contract, Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of  
5 law. (Dkt. No. 38.) Plaintiffs "object to the Court's prior rulings regarding coverage," but  
6 concede that "all of [Plaintiffs'] claims against [Defendant] hinge upon coverage under the  
7 applicable insurance policy." (Dkt. No. 44 at 1.) Plaintiffs also concede that the Court's prior  
8 rulings, "if adhered to, would require [Defendant's] motion for summary judgment to be  
9 granted." (Id. at 1-2.)

10 The Court again finds that Mr. Anderson was not covered as an appointed official under  
11 the insurance policy at issue. The Parties agree that this ruling controls the resolution of all of  
12 Plaintiffs' claims in this matter. (See Dkt. Nos. 38, 44, 46.) Accordingly, the Court GRANTS  
13 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on all of Plaintiffs' claims. (Dkt. No. 38.) The  
14 Court finds that Rule 11 sanctions are not warranted here because Plaintiffs may wish to appeal  
15 the Court's previous order(s), and therefore were under no obligation to dismiss the action;  
16 Defendant's request for sanctions is DENIED. Defendant's Motion for a Protective Order is  
17 DENIED as moot. (Dkt. No. 48.) The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all  
18 counsel.

19  
20 Dated this 9th day of October, 2015.

21  
22 

23 Marsha J. Pechman  
24 Chief United States District Judge